

Primrose Comprehensive Planning Steering Committee Minutes for 16 February 2009

Attending: Dein, Elkins, Garfoot, Gibson, Haack, Hayward, D. Judd, J. Judd

Dein called the meeting to order at 7:35

1. Motion made by Hayward, seconded by Garfoot to approve the November 17, 2008 minutes with the following revision. Item 10 should read. "Motion made by Gibson, seconded by Elkins to strike the sentence in the Public Participation Plan, regarding the meeting times, that read 'These will occur primarily during Planning Commission meetings which are generally scheduled for the first Monday of every month, and Town Board meetings, held the third Tuesday of each month while leaving the sentence which says, 'Public meeting notices will be posted in several locations around the Town, the Town website, and appear in one or more local newspapers.' Motion carried 7-0.

2. Public Comments—

- a. Non-resident households should receive a demographic survey. Not sending a demographic survey to non-resident households suggests that the Town is not interested in the perspective of non-residents.
- b. When there are multiple non-resident landowners on a single parcel, or when a single parcel is in trust, why aren't each of the landowners or each members of the trust going to receive a survey? Who decided this? Wasn't it decided that every landowner was going to get a survey? An answer to this question needs to be provided before the surveys go out.
- c. At what meeting was it decided that when there are multiple non-resident landowners on a single parcel, or when a single parcel is in trust, only one survey will be sent per parcel?
- d. Are all the members of the Steering Committee aware that surveys are not going to every member of a trust or every non-resident co-owner of piece of property?
- e. What is the rationale for differentiating the responses (to the survey) of residents and non-residents? Is that so that the opinions of the non-residents can be ignored?
- f. The process of having questions asked during the Public Comment period, but not answered until later is not 'public participation'. Questions should be answered at the time they are asked, and there should be an opportunity then for discussion.
- g. At the Caucus, Dein offered a demonstration of how to access the Town Square. Notification was not given that this demonstration would be offered. Dein said that, because it was merely informational— to explain to citizens how to participate— so there was no requirement that official notification be given. He said that he only thought of it the night before the Caucus. But notification only require 24 hrs. So if he thought of it the night before, official notification should have been given. Because notification was not given, not many people came to the Caucus for that purpose.
- h. The reason that the mailing list was delayed was not owing to any inaction on the part of the Clerk, who had it ready in December, but because the mailing list was circulated to members of the Steering Committee who were checking it for accuracy.
- i. Any revision of the Public Participation Plan has to go to the Town Board.
- j. The dates for the contract with the County regarding Comprehensive Planning are likely to expire before the planning is complete. Is anyone discussing an extension of those dates with the County?
- k. It was said that the proposed amendment (Connors and O'Connor) to the Town Land Use plan would come up in the Land Use section of Comprehensive Planning, and that was likely to begin in January. When is that going to come up?
- l. On the Town website, there are not links connecting everything that is going on. Some of the

documents regarding drafts are not present or are not in the 'Document' section.

m. Where on the website are the emails to be found between members of the Steering Committee members?

n. Why aren't the discussions among Steering Committee Members that appear on the Town Square given notification in the paper. Can Steering Committee members have such discussions online with giving notification of those discussions?

o. Why do the Town-Square at all?

p. What is the procedure for having house parties? How many house parties have there been? Have house parties been posted?

q. Why do emails between Steering Committee members have to be requested from Winnie, rather than just be posted on the Website? The process should be more transparent.

r. Does not understand what is going on on the Town Square—thought that all discussions on the Town Square would be there for anyone to read.

Public Comments section closed.

3. Discussion of status of the Community list and survey:

Report by Dein: Dein reported that the list was made up from tax roles and voter roles. He distributed the list to members of the Steering Committee for them to check the accuracy of the list— people who might be being double counted or not counted at all— and he made a cover letter to accompany the Survey. More and more additions to the list kept coming in. There were some properties held in Trust with many non-resident trustees. So he looked into how Trusts were treated legally. He found that legally Trusts are treated as individual entities, and thought that on the basis of this, it would be sufficient to send a single land use survey to land held in trust. The same reasoning applied he thought to Businesses and to single parcels of land held by more than one non-resident land owners. The business or parcel should be treated as a single entity and one land use survey sent per business or parcel. He also said that the demographic information was supposed to be information about the Town residents, and so he had not planned to send the demographic survey to non-resident landowners. He then asked for a decision about how the Steering Committee wanted to proceed in sending out the survey.

Discussion among Steering Committee members:

Several members expressed agreement with Dein's rationale about how to proceed— that in the case of parcels owned by non-residents, we should send one land use survey per tax parcel to non-resident landowners, and send no demographic survey. One member thought that when there were multiple trustees or multiple non-resident land-owners of a parcel, surveys should be sent to each and every such individual. He thought that. as land owners, each should have as much say or more than residents who did not own land (renters) who might only live in the Township a short time. It was argued against this that our primary responsibility is to residents of the Township, and that, in a modern democracy, a person's right to vote is not premised on a person's owning land. Nor do people with more land get a greater number of votes. So every voting-age resident of the Township should receive a survey.

As to the question of whether each trustee or each of multiple non-resident landowners of a single tax-parcel should receive a survey, the following comments were made: (i) It seems that some communities have not sought the input of non-resident land-owners in their surveys at all, others have sent out one survey per parcel, and others may have sent surveys to each of the multiple land-owners of a single tax parcel. What the majority of the members of the Steering Committee is proposing to do is more than some communities have done, and in line with what other communities have done. (ii) The interest of non-resident landowners, many of whom do not live in the County or State can be quite different from the

interests of residents of the Township. To provide surveys for all the many trustees and multiple landowners of single parcels would give a disproportionate say to people who do not live in the community. (iii) If each non-resident part owner of a given parcel were to complete a survey, a property owned by four people would have four times the voice or representation as a property owned by one person. This makes little sense.

The following motion was made by Gibson, and seconded by Hayward: To approve the distribution of the Survey to the Primrose Community as follows: One land use survey will be sent to each voting-age resident of the Town, and for non-resident landowners and trusts, one land use survey would be sent to the address listed on the tax-role. One demographic survey will be sent to each resident house-hold.

Motion carried 7-1.

Notice that several of the questions asked in the public comment section were addressed by this discussion—namely, a, b, c, d, and e.

4. Comprehensive Planning development process—

Comments on the Town Square—

Several members asked Dein about the members' participation on the Town Square. According to Open Meetings laws does it have to be officially noticed each time we go on the Town Square? Can we all be on at the same time and have a discussion? Does it matter if we log on at different times and leave comments? Dein said that in the Comprehensive Planning Documents, there is an official notice of the possibility that a quorum of the Town Board or Planning Commission members may be present on the Town Square discussing some issue. This official notice was written by the County specifically to comply with State Open Meeting Laws. Because of this notice, it is legal for a quorum to be present on the Town Square, so the Steering Committee members may all be on the Town Square at the same time or, or some of us may be, or we can log on and put comments when it is convenient for us to do so. All comments we make on the Town Square are there for anyone to see. Below is a copy of a portion of the document that gives notification of the possibility of meetings on the Town Square:

This hereby serves as an official notice pursuant to the state Open Meetings Law that a possible quorum of town governmental bodies may exist while participating on the Town of Primrose Comprehensive Plan project electronic discussion forum, accessible online at this listed web address:

<http://tn.primrose.wi.gov/BulletinBoard.htm>. The electronic discussion forum discussion will last the duration of the Town of Primrose Comprehensive Plan project (approximately June, 2009). At any given time, a quorum of any Town of Primrose committee, Planning Commission, or the Town Board, could be participating in a discussion on this site. However, no governmental body will convene or make any decisions while active on the electronic discussion forum - the electronic discussion forum exists for discussion and informational purposes only. The websites are all publicly accessible and reviewable. This discussion answered questions or comments n and r submitted in the Public Comment section of this meeting.

Transportation Element—

It was decided to keep the current draft for now, and to continue to take in citizens input on the transportation draft before completing that element.

Issues and Opportunities Element—

The Steering Committee went through various public comments made on November 17 regarding the goals and vision for the Township. The Committee thought that only the most general goals and visions, and ones the Town could actually have some influence on, should be included in this Element. Other

more particular goals and visions should be considered in the appropriate Element. It was the committee's view that comments (e) and (f) were already included in the draft which says — "(i) Encourage land uses that are consistent with and contribute to the Town's agricultural and rural character. (ii) Promote the long-term preservation of farmland within the Town. (iii) Preserve the Town's unique and sensitive natural resources to ensure a high-quality environment for the benefit of future generations." It was the committee's view that (t) should be included in the draft, and could be by adding word "scenic" to the sentence (i). So (i) revised would read "Encourage land uses that are consistent with and contribute to the Town's agricultural, scenic, and rural character." That revision is to be made. It was the committee's view that to the extent that the town could address (j), (o), and (s), they were addressed in (i)-(iii). Comments (l) and (m) should be considered in the transportation Element, (h) and (i) in the economic development or utility Element. And the part of (t) that regards the preservation of structures together with (r) should be considered in the economic or cultural resources Element.

5. Discussion for the next CP element and meeting date— It was decided that we had better try to tackle a couple more of the easier elements of the CP, and to let Standing suggest which two to do next. A tentative date was set for March 2nd, depending upon whether Standing could make that date.

6. Motion to adjourn made by Gibson, seconded by J. Judd. Motion carried 8-0.

Respectfully submitted by Martha Gibson